URBAN/MUNICIPAL
CA4 ON HBL W26
M37
1996

MINUTES OF THE

SPECIAL EDUCATION

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MARCH 20, 1996 ...

URBAN/MUNICIPAL
CA4 ON HBL W26
M37
1996

# PECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
## 1996 03 20

**Present:** Mr. D. Bucsis (Chairman); Trustees Bishop, Patenaude and Rogers; Mesdames Bramberger, Dalziel, Kappheim, Kerr Jaskiewicz, Oommen and Savelli; Messrs. Shields and Verticchio; Dr. Van der Spuy.

**Not Present:** Trustee Stewart; Mesdames Barnes, Barr, Burns and Simms-Obidi; Dr. Newberry.

URBAN MUNICIPAL

**Also Present:** E. Collins (Hamilton Principals' Association)
S. O'Brien (Hamilton Secondary School Principals' Council)

APR 22 1996

**Officials Present:** E. Bond (Superintendent of Program)
Dr. J. Tomlinson (Project Team Leader - Special Education)

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Mr. Bucsis called the meeting to order, noting regrets for not attending were received from Trustees Stewart and Mulholland; Mesdames Barr and Burns. He then called for confirmation of the minutes.

Moved by Ms. Kerr Jaskiewicz:

That the minutes of the 1996 02 21 meeting be approved. **CARRIED**

**Remarks**

Chairman

Mr. Bucsis referred to the Board's Second Annual Parent Conference on Saturday, 1996 04 13 at Sherwood Secondary School (8:30 am to 3:15 pm) and encouraged the members to attend. The members concurred that a display booth would be helpful in providing SEAC information. Dr. Tomlinson agreed to update the SEAC brochures and have copies available at the conference. Mr. Bucsis, Trustee Bishop, Mesdames Kappheim and Oommen volunteered their assistance at this event.

Project Team Leader - Special Education

See Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process on Page 2.

Superintendent of Program

Miss Bond apprised the members on the initial Budget presentation at last night's Operations and Finance Committee meeting, noting that the updated Budget Reduction target of $22.8 million could relate to program (mandated and non-mandated) and staffing cuts.

In terms of staff reduction, Miss Bond explained the implications to the collective agreement, noting that the "bumping" process is based on seniority. She cautioned that some staff with qualifications for certain programs may not be in the same position by next school year.

Mesdames Collins and O'Brien remarked that the federations are aware of the concerns raised by parents of Special Education students in terms of the impending budget reductions. The members were assured that staffing needs will continue to take into closer consideration the best interests of the students.

## GENERAL

**Presentation - Association for Bright Children**

This presentation will be held at a future meeting.

**Organizational Updates**
The following updates were provided:

■Mrs. Bishop provided a brief overview of the preliminary budget initiatives presented at last night's meeting.

Relative to the on-going school visits by the Secondary Futures Committee, Mrs. Bishop assured that the requirements of special needs students are being considered.

■Dr. Van der Spuy [Ontario Psychological Association] referred to the Association's recent annual conference.

■Mr. Shields [Hamilton Association for Community Living] reported the following:

.the Association will host the "Focus on Summer 1996", an information session for parents, on Wednesday, 1996 04 03 from 7:00 to 10:00 pm in the cafeteria at 191 York Boulevard, Hamilton. [A copy of the flyer is on file in the Minute Room.]
.the Association is working, in conjunction with other community groups, on pre-schooling initiatives in light of the possible end to the Junior Kindergarten program.

**Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process**
Dr. Tomlinson reviewed the report.

Expressing their concerns, the members agreed the following areas require closer consideration:

■screening process and programming for gifted students
■perceived inconsistencies in the statistical data, results and recommendations and representative sample of parent comments, particularly relative to the gifted program
■need for statistical data by exceptionality

Dr. Tomlinson agreed to review these areas and incorporate the appropriate revisions into the document.

Moved by Mr. Shields:

That the Report regarding the Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process be received for information and the following recommendation approved:

(a) That the recommendations from the Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process be forwarded to the Program Committee.
**CARRIED**

**Thirteenth Annual Review of Special Education Programs and Services**
The members agreed to consider this item at the April meeting.

The meeting then adjourned.

Read and confirmed,

_____
CHAIRMAN

URBAN/MUNICIPAL
CA4 ON HBL W26
M37
1996

# MINUTES OF THE
# AL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
## 1996 04 17

**Present:** Mr. Bucsis (Chairman); Trustees Bishop and Stewart; Mesdames Bramberger, Dalziel, Kappheim, Kerr Jaskiewicz, Oommen, Savelli and Simms-Obidi.

**Not Present:** Trustees Patenaude and Rogers, Mesdames Barnes, Barr and Burns' Messrs. Shields and Verticchio and Dr. Van der Spuy.

URBAN MUNICIPAL

**Also Present:** Trustee Mulholland

MAY 14 1996

**Officials Present:** Miss E. Bond (Superintendent of Program)
Dr. J. Tomlinson (Project Team Leader - Special Education).

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Mr. Bucsis called the meeting to order noting regrets for not being able to attend had been received from Trustees Patenaude and Rogers, Mesdames Barr, Burns, Messrs. Shields Verticchio and Dr. Vander Spuy.

Once a quorum was obtained, it was moved by Mrs. Oommen:

That the minutes of the 1996 03 20 meeting be approved. **CARRIED.**

**Remarks:**

Chairman: Mr. Bucsis read a letter from Premier Michael Harris responding to concerns about proposed changes to the Ontario Building Code [attached]

Project Team Leader - Special Education: Dr. Tomlinson commented the Board's recent Parents' Conference was an excellent opportunity to dialogue with parents.

Superintendent of Program

In the light of recent budget discussions regarding transportation, Miss Bond suggested it would be appropriate to discuss transportation and implications for program within the time alloted for the Learning Centre presentation.

## GENERAL

**Presentation - Down Syndrome Association**

Mrs. Oommen provided a brief history of the Association, its membership, Vision and Goals. She distributed an information brochure noting the Association meets the last Wednesday of the month at the Association for Community Living building on York Blvd. In response to questions, Mrs. Oommen made two observations: a) there is an increased number of Down Syndrome children born to younger mothers and b) use of Amniocentesis testing may impact on the number of Down Syndrome births.

## ORGANIZATIONAL UPDATES

The following updates were provided:

- Ms. Kerr Jaskiewicz [Hamilton and District Easter Seals Parent Delegate Group] will provide further information to Miss Bond regarding a situation in which two children in a regular class were advised they must return to their home school due to transportation cuts.

- Ms. Dalziel [Hamilton and District Society for Disabled Children] voiced her concern with the Premier's response regarding the Ontario Building Code, as it appears contrary to concerns raised about these changes.

- Miss Bond confirmed for Ms. Kappheim [Association for Bright Children] that there has been no communication with schools to discontinue pyschological testing. She noted the importance of discussing an action plan relative to the implementation of Learning Centres to allay concerns and miscommunication.

- Referring to a dated SEAC information flyer, Mrs. Oommen [Down Syndrome Association] suggested it be updated and distributed through all schools each September. Miss Bond will explore options, including SEAC's budget, to augment distribution of this information more widely. Ms. Collins suggested another alternative would be to include this information in the Elementary and Secondary School Year Calendars. Mrs. Oommen also commented on the positive response to SEAC information at the Parent Conference.

Thanks were offered to the following SEAC members who provided information to parents about SEAC at the Parent Conference: Mesdames Kerr Jaskiewicz, Savelli, Kappheim and Oommen.

- On behalf behalf of Mr. Shields [Association for Community Living], Mrs. Oommen distributed brochures regarding a LifeTRUST Planning Seminar, 1996 05 23.

- Ms. Savelli [Child and Adults with Attention Deficit Disorders] commented on the increase in attendance at their monthly meeting following the Parent Conference.

- Ms. Bramberger [Hamilton-Wentworth Home Care Program] inquired whether Mr. Bucsis or Mr. Stewart had received a package of information from the Ontario Association for Families with Children with Communication Disorders. Although neither Chairmen recalled receiving this information to date, Ms. Bramberger understood it was a positive package of information for trustees and school personnel regarding the needs of school aged children.

- Mrs. Bishop noted a) her concern that the Health Task Force's "Health Plan for the Community" does not address children's needs. Copies of the plan are available to the public. b) The Board's budget, while not complete, presently stands at a Mill Rate of 3.567%.

- Ms. O'Brien [Hamilton Secondary School Principals' Council] circulated information about a Sleep/Wake Disorders Canada meeting, 1996 04 30, commenting on the number of adolescents who may need advice and support on this issue.

Miss Bond advised that Principals are now aware of the transportation budget decision. She stated that an Implementation Committee will plan an in-service for Principals on May 6th to ensure the proper information is communicated at the annual IPRC reviews. An Action Plan with dates will be established. Both Mrs. Kappheim and Mrs. Bishop have indicated their interest in participating on the Implementation Committee. Updates will be provided to SEAC on a monthly basis.

Responding to Mr. Stewart's concerns about the date for the Principal in-service, Miss Bond observed the May 6th date allows for preparation time to address several issues:
~ determine the number of special needs classes (i.e., review students' needs and current program to determine whether a home setting placement is possible.

~ create a unified plan so parents do not get mixed messages
~ transportation issues - input and suggestions from parents, i.e. drop off points to enable students to have a program
~ input from SEAC
~ IPRCs may be held during the summer if necessary to accommodate the number of meetings

**Thirteenth Annual Review of Special Education Programs**

Dr. Tomlinson presented the Annual Review. She also circulated a revised Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process (IPRC) amended to reflect comments from the March meeting which will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry. [attached]

Referring to the IPRC Review, Ms. Kappheim noted her concerns about interpretation of the data in questions #20, #22 and #23, requesting that only statisical data from the survey and parents' actual comments be included in the report.

Following a brief discussion, Miss Bond offered to amend the report in consultation with Ms. Kappheim.

Moved by Miss Dalziel:

That the Thirteenth Annual Review (1995-1996) Provision of Special Education Programs and Services, as amended, be approved for submission to the Ministry of Education and Training.

**CARRIED.**

Update - Learning Centres

Dr. Tomlinson and Miss Bond provided information outlining the description and parameters of Learning Centres. [attached] The following additional comments were offered about Learning Centres:
~ provide an additional learning opportunity for a) students moving from special classes (particularly in middle schools) who can function in the Learning Centre with some support to adapt to a larger class environment and b) students in regular classes who can use the Learning Centre as a resource opportunity for extra support without moving into a special class. Common Curriculum and Individual Pupil Plan (IPP) outcomes would still be met in this new concept.
~ does not replace any current model and is not a special class placement, such as Comprehensive Classes
~ Pupil-Teacher Ratio (PTR) will fluctuate dependant on the students' identifications and their needs
~ a review of students' needs will indicate the number of students capable of benefiting from the Learning Centres model
~ both the Learning Centre teacher and regular class teacher will provide input into pupil tracking
~ "like" needs and abilities can work with peers

It was agreed:

That the Verbal Update regarding Learning Centres be received for information.

Update - Transportation - Special Education

Relative to transportation, Miss Bond explained that the funds available for transportation are significantly less and will affect special education children. Some parents have indicated their interest in viable alternatives, including transporting their own children and pick-up points at schools. The Board is also presently negotiating with its carriers for lower rates.

In order to facilitate parental understanding, public meetings will be held with a view to answering questions about the Learning Centre model and discussing transportation solutions. In order to determine the number of Special Education students that can realistically be transported, a manual review of student records will take place. Under IPRC placement, Miss Bond noted that a three-month placement is possible with the option to review placement at the end of that period.

Moved by Ms. Kappheim:

That the Committee continue to meet to 21:20 hours. **CARRIED**

Miss Bond responded to questions from Ms. Kappheim regarding the Gifted Program:
~ Comprehensive classes - It was not the expectation to have individual Gifted students in this model
~ Gifted programming - would continue despite cuts but the issue now is how to get children to the program.
~ Difficulty in providing programming/transportation for one/two students as opposed to larger number of students
~ Future possibility of phasing out congregated classes for Gifted - should budgetary decisions dictate alternatives being considered, parents would be involved
~ The intent of the Learning Centre model is to return staff and resources to home schools which could limit staffing available for special classes. While Gifted program is the most cost-effective Special Education program, transportation remains the issue.

Mr. Bucsis briefly referred to Dr. Bountrogiani's report to this Committee about whether special education placements are effective. Miss Bond affirmed the planned research would continue.

Prior to adjournment, Miss Bond encouraged members to contact her with any input.

It was agreed:

That the Verbal Update regarding Transportation - Special Education be received for information.

Read and confirmed,

.....
Chairman

cv

Ontario

The Premier of Ontario | Le Premier ministre de l'Ontario

Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1A1

Hôtel du gouvernement
Queen's Park
Toronto (Ontario)
M7A 1A1

April 3, 1996

Mr. David Bucsis
Chairperson
Special Education Advisory Committee
Board of Education for the City of Hamilton
P.O. Box 2558
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 3L1

Dear Mr. Bucsis:

Thank you for expressing your concerns on the review of the *Ontario Building Code* (OBC), in particular the issue of accessibility for the disabled. I welcome this opportunity to hear from you on this issue and I appreciate your taking the time to share your views with me.

This government recognizes the importance of accessibility for the disabled and the significant progress made in this regard. The intent behind releasing the *Back to Basics* consultation paper was to seek public input on the appropriate focus of the OBC. Re-focusing the OBC's mandate will assist the government in removing regulatory barriers to job creation while maintaining public safety and security.

Let me assure you that the government does not intend to reduce the provisions regarding disabled access which are currently in the OBC. We are however, committed to revising the current OBC with one that recognizes the realities of today's building market.

Any changes we make will seek to ensure the continued safety and security of Ontarians. This consultation paper will ensure we look at a number of options that will meet this objective.

Again, thanks for writing. We'll keep your comments in mind as we work to deliver the changes we pledged to the people of Ontario.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Harris, MPP

**The Board of Education for the City of Hamilton**
Le Conseil de l'éducation de la ville de Hamilton

100 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
Telephone (905) 527-5092
Fax (905) 521-2538

100, rue Main Ouest
Hamilton (Ontario)
Téléphone (905) 527-5
Télécopieur (905) 521-2

**Program Department**

**Département de programmes**

February 22, 1996

Premier Mike Harris
Room 281
Main Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1A1

To Premier Harris:

The Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) is an advisory committee to the Board of Education for the City of Hamilton. SEAC represents exceptional students who are resident within our Board. These students include those with physical, communication, intellectual, behavioural and multiple disabilities.

SEAC is deeply concerned about proposed changes to the Building Code outlined in the *Back to Basics* consultation paper. For many years, we have endeavoured to promote accessibility within our schools for our students and staff.

Accessibility is a right, not a privilege. Changes your government has suggested to the Ontario Building Code threaten to remove that right for thousands of Ontario citizens and taxpayers.

We oppose any change that would limit the scope of Building Code regulations dealing with accessibility. Your government's proposal, *Back to Basics*, would eliminate twenty years of progress towards accessibility for people with disabilities.

Accessibility is a principle of the Ontario Building Code that must be preserved and improved upon. We urge you to reconsider your government's position on this issue.

Yours truly,

David Bucsis, Chairperson, Special Education Advisory Committee,
Board of Education for the City of Hamilton

c: Ann Borooah, Director
Housing Development and Buildings Branch
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 2558
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 3L1

Adresse postale
C.P. 2558
Hamilton (Ontario)
L8N 3L1

**The Board of Education for the City of Hamilton**
Le Conseil de l'éducation de la ville de Hamilton

100 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
Telephone (905) 527-5092
Fax (905) 521-2538

100, rue Main Ouest
Hamilton (Ontario)
Téléphone (905) 527-5092
Télécopieur (905) 521-2538

**Program Department**

**Département de programmes**

**REVISED** 1996 April 17

**TO:** Chairman and Members
Special Education Advisory Committee

**FROM:** E. G. Bond, Superintendent of Program

**RE:** Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process

**REPORT:** Information

**Background:**
A review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee process was initiated in 1994 to determine parental satisfaction with the IPRC process. In July, 1994, questionnaires were sent to parents of students who had participated in the IPRC process during the school year 1993-94. In September, 1994, SEAC requested that the questionnaires be sent out to parents of **all** exceptional students. As a result, schools distributed questionnaires to parents who had not previously received them. In total 2400 questionnaires were distributed and 496 responses were received, representing a response rate of approximately 20%. (Appendix I) Tables 1 and 2 indicate the number of responses by exceptionality and placement.

The results of the survey contained in Appendix II indicate the percentage of positive and negative responses for each question. The results were analyzed by year (1993-94 and prior to 1993), exceptionality and placement (regular and self-contained). Although the analysis indicated few areas of significant difference, there are a number of areas of practical significance, which are reported in the comments. Recommendations are included for questions where there was less than a ninety-five percent positive response. A representative sample of parent comments is included in Appendix III.

**Issue:**
To share information with SEAC members regarding the results of the IPRC Parent Questionnaire.

**Recommendations:**
1. That the Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process be received for information.
2. That the recommendations from the Review of the Identification, Placement and Review Committee Process be forwarded to the Program Committee.

**Rationale:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Appendix I | IPRC Parent Questionnaire/Summary of Responses |
| Appendix II | IPRC Parent Questionnaire: Results and Recommendations |
| Appendix III | A Representative Sample of Parent Comments |

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 2558
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 3L1

Adresse postale
C.P. 2558
Hamilton (Ontario)
L8N 3L1

REVISED

-6-

# APPENDIX II
# IPRC QUESTIONNAIRE:
# Results and Recommendations

February 5, 1996

The Program Department believes that program accountability must be of the highest standard. Therefore recommendations have been provided for all responses which indicated an overall positive response rate of less than 95%, regardless of statistical significance. ($p<.05$)

Special Education Services would like to acknowledge the assistance of the following individuals in the collation of this data.
Connie Kidd, Research Services
Marie Brown, Secretary
Report prepared by Dr. Janice Tomlinson, Project Team Leader, Special Education

---

## IPRC Parent Questionnaire

The Identification, Placement and Review process began at the school when the school observed that your child had special needs. The school held a meeting, called a Diagnostic and Resource Team (DART) meeting to discuss your child's needs with you and the school resource team. Please answer the following questions about the DART meeting.

**DART Meeting**

| | | Please circle Yes or No to indicate your answer | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No |
| 1. | I was welcomed by the school team. | 97.2 | 2.8 |
| 2. | I understood the information given to me by school/staff about my child. | 97.7 | 2.3 |
| 3. | I was invited to ask questions and give my opinions. | 97.2 | 2.8 |
| 4. | I understood the plans that were made to help my child as a result of this meeting. | 96.4 | 3.6 |
| 5. | I was kept informed about my child's progress after the meeting. | 89.2 | 10.8 |

**Of a total of 454 parents who responded to this question, 49 parents felt that they had not been kept informed of their child's progress between the DART meeting and the IPRC meeting. While this percentage was not of statistical significance by exceptionality or year, there was a significant difference according to placement. More parents of students who were subsequently placed in self-contained placements (94.6%) indicated that they were kept informed than were parents of students who remained in regular class placements (86.8%). This difference in parental contact may be attributed to program modifications in the regular classroom, resulting in student success and potentially fewer parent meetings.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS: That schools continue to keep parents informed about student progress through the DART process and other appropriate methods of communication.**

Sometime after the DART meeting, a special meeting was held which determined that your child was an exceptional student (i.e. your child would receive special education programming). That meeting was called an Identification, Placement and Review Committee (IPRC) meeting. Please answer the following questions about that meeting.

**IPRC Meeting**

| | | Please circle Yes or No to indicate your answer | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No |
| 6. | I was invited to attend the IPRC meeting. | 97.7 | 2.3 |
| 7. | The time of the IPRC meeting was convenient. | 91.4 | 8.6 |

**Of the 475 parents who responded to this question, 41 felt that the time of the IPRC meeting was not convenient. There was no significant difference by year or exceptionality. A greater number of parents with students in regular class placement felt that the time had not been convenient.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That Special Education Services, in consultation with Elementary and Secondary School principals, review the schedule for IPRC meeting times.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | The place of the IPRC meeting was convenient. | 94.1 | 5.9 |

**Of the 476 parents who responded to this question, 28 felt that the place of the IPRC meeting was not convenient. There was no significant difference by year, placement or exceptionality. IPRC's are typically held in several locations to endeavour to meet parental needs.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That, wherever possible and practical, IPRC meetings continue to be held in locations that are convenient to the majority of parents.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | An advocate or friend was present with me at the meeting. | 48.7 | 51.3 |

**Approximately half of respondents indicated that they had brought an advocate or friend with them to the IPRC meeting. There was no significant difference by year, placement or exceptionality.**
**While the IPRC process and procedures have been designed to be flexible and relaxed, parents often indicate that they feel anxious about the IPRC process. The presence of a friend or advocate can help lessen the anxiety and result in a more productive meeting. Therefore, parents have been encouraged by schools and by the community to bring re-representatives with them to the IPRC meeting to listen to the discussion and provide parental support.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That schools continue to encourage parents , if they wish, to bring a representative to the IPRC meeting for support.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | I was welcomed by the Committee. | 97.0 | 3.0 |
| 11. | The people at the meeting were introduced to me. | 96.8 | 3.2 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12. | I understood why the people at the meeting were there. | 94.9 | 5.1 |

**Of the 470 parents who responded to this question, 24 did not understand the role of each participant at the meeting. There was no significant difference by year, placement or exceptionality.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That, prior to the IPRC meeting, schools continue to inform parents of the IPRC participants and their role in the IPRC process.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | I understood that this meeting was held to decide Exceptionality and Placement (i.e. self-contained or regular class). | 97.3 | 2.7 |
| 14. | I was aware of the information that was going to be presented at the IPRC meeting. | 87.8 | 12.2 |

**Of the 475 parents who responded to this question, 58 indicated that they were not aware of the information that would be presented to the Identification, Placement and Review Committee. There was a significant difference for year and placement. A greater percentage of parents who had participated in the IPRC process prior to 1993-94 or whose children were in self-contained placements felt that they were aware of the information that would be brought before the Committee.**

**It is important for parents to be well-informed about information that will be presented at an IPRC meeting. Although information about a student is shared with parents through the DART process, as well as at other parent meetings, the groups of parents represented may not have been aware of the specific information that would be presented to the Committee.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That, prior to the IPRC meeting, schools inform parents of the specific information that will be presented at the Identification, Placement and Review Committee meeting.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15. | I understood the information that was shared about my child. | 97.3 | 2.7 |
| 16. | I was invited to ask questions and to give my opinions. | 97.9 | 2.1 |
| 17. | I understood the forms that I was requested to sign at the meeting. | 97.9 | 2.1 |
| 18. | The Committee listened to my concerns. | 96.6 | 3.4 |
| 19. | The decisions were made in the best interests of my child. | 96.6 | 3.4 |
| 20. | I had a significant part in the decisions made about my child. | 93.3 | 7.7 |

**Of the 470 parents who responded to this question, 36 felt that they had not had a significant role to play in the decisions made about their child. There was no significant difference for year or placement. There was a significant difference for exceptionality.**

**In accordance with the legislation, the Identification, Placement and Review Committee is responsible to make a determination regarding identification and placement of exceptional students. While parents have direct input to the Committee deliberations regarding identification and placement, they are not part of the Committee and hence do not make the final decision. However, parental consent is necessary prior to placement in special education placement.**

**It is important for parents to feel that they have had an opportunity to present input to the IPRC Committee to assist in its deliberations. At present, schools and the IPRC Committee encourage parents to discuss information that they feel is relevant during the IPRC meeting.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That parents continue to be encouraged, by schools and by the Identification, Placement and Review Committee, to share information that will assist the Committee in making its determination regarding identification and placement.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21. | The Annual Review process was explained to me. | 93.6 | 6.4 |

**Of the 469 parents who responded to this question, 30 parents indicated that the Annual Review process had not been explained to them. There was no significant difference for year, placement or exceptionality.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That the Identification, Placement and Review Committee explain the Annual Review process to parents at the IPRC meeting.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 22. | I am satisfied that, since the IPRC meeting , my child's needs are being met. | 85.8 | 14.2 |

**Of the 451 parents who responded to this question, 64 parents indicated some concern that their child's needs were not being met. There was no significant difference for year or exceptionality, but there was a significant difference for placement. Parents of students in self-contained settings indicated a higher degree (90%) of satisfaction than parents of students in regular class settings (79%)**

**The higher degrees of expressed parental satisfaction with self-contained placements may be attributed to the actual physical change in placement (i.e. regular class to self-contained class). While the exceptional student who is placed in a regular class setting receives an Individual Pupil Plan including modifications to program, the student who is placed in a self-contained program actually physically moves into another classroom and/or school. This change may be seen as more dramatic, and parents may perceive it as a "real" change, in contrast to program changes within the regular classroom which may be more difficult for the student to describe. Consequently, it is important for parents, students and teachers to be aware that student needs are being met, regardless of placement.**

**Within the exceptionality groups, there were some non-statistically significant trends of note. Parents of students who were deemed as speech/language indicated a high (94.7%) degree of satisfaction with their child's program. Parents of students in small sample sizes (e.g. autistic, developmentally disabled, deaf/hard of hearing and visually impaired) also indicated a high degree (100%)of satisfaction. Parents of students with specific learning disabilities (84.1%), general learning disabilities (86%) or as gifted (77.5%) were less satisfied that student needs were being met after the IPRC.**

**The most effective vehicle for discussion of exceptional student needs is through the Individual Pupil Plan, which describes the program and strategies which the student is following. It is important for parents, teachers and students to be involved in the development and monitoring of student progress through the IPP.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That schools continue to use the Individual Pupil Plan to plan and monitor student progress.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 23. | I have discussed my child's program and Individual Pupil Plan (IPP) with school staff. | 80.1 | 19.9 |

**Of the 447 parents who responded to this question, 89 parents indicated that they had not yet discussed their child's program and IPP with staff. There was no significant difference for placement or exceptionality, but there was a significant difference for year. Parents who participated in the IPRC process during the school year 1993-94 (82.8%) were more likely to have discussed the IPP with school staff, in contrast to groups prior to 1993 (70.7%). This trend indicates that schools are involving parents in the IPP process.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That a) development of the Individual Pupil Plan for all exceptional students be done in a timely manner, with parental involvement and student involvement, as appropriate.**

**b) parental feedback regarding student progress, using the Individual Pupil Plan as a vehicle, be provided on a regular basis.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24. | I am comfortable discussing my child's program with school staff. | 94.1 | 5.9 |

**Of the 460 parents who responded to this question, 433 parents indicated that they felt comfortable discussing their child's program with staff. There was no significant difference for year, placement or exceptionality.**

**RECOMMENDATION: That schools continue to be inviting and accepting of parents as active participants in the education of their children.**

TABLE 1:RESPONDENTS BY EXCEPTIONALITY

| EXCEPTIONALITY | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Autistic | 7 | 1% |
| Behavioural | 14 | 3% |
| Developmental Disability | 5 | 1% |
| Gifted | 79 | 16% |
| General Learning Disability | 61 | 12% |
| Hard of Hearing/Deaf | 3 | >1% |
| Multiple | 8 | 2% |
| Physical | 7 | 1% |
| Specific Learning Disability | 142 | 29% |
| Speech and Language | 40 | 8% |
| Visually Impaired | 2 | >1% |
| Unknown | 128 | 26% |
| TOTAL | 496 | 100% |

TABLE 2

TABLE 2: RESPONDENTS BY PLACEMENT

| PLACEMENT | # | % |
|---|---|---|
| Regular Class | 170 | 34% |
| Self-Contained | 198 | 40% |
| Unknown | 128 | 26% |
| TOTAL | 496 | 100% |

# SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That schools continue to keep parents informed about student progress through the DART process and other appropriate methods of communication

2. That Special Education Services, in consultation with Elementary and Secondary School principals, review the schedule for IPRC meeting times

3. That, wherever possible and practical, IPRC meetings continue to be held in locations that are convenient to the majority of parents.

4. That schools continue to encourage parents , if they wish, to bring a representative to the IPRC meeting for support.

5. That, prior to the IPRC meeting, schools continue to inform parents of the IPRC participants and their role in the IPRC process.

6. That, prior to the IPRC meeting, schools inform parents of the specific information that will be presented at the Identification, Placement and Review Committee meeting.

7. That parents continue to be encouraged, by schools and by the Identification, Placement and Review Committee, to share information that will assist the Committee in making its determination regarding identification and placement.

8. That the Identification, Placement and Review Committee explain the Annual Review process to parents at the IPRC meeting.

9. That schools continue to use the Individual Pupil Plan to plan and monitor student progress.

10. That a) development of the Individual Pupil Plan for all exceptional students be done in a timely manner, with parental involvement and student involvement, as appropriate.
    b) parental feedback regarding student progress, using the Individual Pupil Plan as a vehicle, be provided on a regular basis.

11. That schools continue to be inviting and accepting of parents as active participants in the education of their children.

# Learning Centre: Description and Parameters

Learning Centres have been developed within the Board of Education for the City of Hamilton to meet the needs of exceptional students in their home schools. Each school's learning centre will be different, but there are some basic parameters that will be central to all learning centres.

Learning centres require administrative and staff commitment in both philosophy and practice. Learning centres are staffed by special education teachers, with support from other staff. Collaboration between regular class teachers and learning centre teachers is ongoing. Differentiated programming occurs within the learning centre in content, process, product and evaluation. Students and staff learn transferable skills for use in the regular classroom and beyond. Students are taught using a variety of methods, including direct instruction.

***Students achieve learning outcomes.***

- **meets the needs of exceptional students in their home school**
- **shared responsibility for students and student learning (regular class teacher, learning centre teacher, student, parent)**
- **collaborative planning and programming**
- **differentiated programming (content, process, product, evaluation)**
- **focus on learning outcomes and Individual Pupil Plans**
- **direct instruction**
- **reflects school culture**
- **administration and staff commitment: principle & practice**
- **integral part of school plan**
- **staffed by special education personnel**
- **students begin the year in their integrated placement**
- **Learning Centre is operational from the first day of school**
- **flexibility, based on student needs**
- **communication**

*"All kids can learn and succeed, but not on the same day and not in the same way."*
(Spady)

URBAN/MUNICIPAL
CA4 ON HBL W26
M37
1996

# SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
## 1996 05 15

Present: Mr. Bucsis (Chairman); Trustees Bishop and Rogers; Mesdames Bramberger, Burns, Dalziel, Kappheim, Kerr Jaskiewicz, Oommen and Simms-Obidi; Mr. Shields.

**Also Present:** Mesdames E. Collins (Hamilton Principals' Association) and S. O'Brien (Hamilton Secondary School Principals' Council).

**Officials Present:** Miss E. Bond (Superintendent of Program) and Dr. J. Tomlinson (Project Team Leader - Special Education).

Dr. Bucsis called the meeting to order, noting regrets for not attending were received from Trustee Patenaude, Mesdames Barr, Hutchinson, Savelli; and Dr. Van der Spuy. He then called for confirmation of the minutes.

URBAN MUNICIPAL
JUN 25 1996
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Moved by Ms. Kerr Jaskiewicz:

That the minutes of the 1996 04 17 meeting be approved. **CARRIED**

**Remarks:**

Chairman

Mr. Bucsis drew the members' attention to the following correspondence:

- Letter from Mr. Goodridge to Ms. S. Barnes [Canadian National Institute for the Blind] expressing concern and requesting clarification on Ms. Barnes' non-attendance at three consecutive SEAC meetings.

- Letter of appreciation from Ms. K. Brink, Vice-Principal - R.A. Riddell School, for SEAC's participation at the Board's recent Parents' Conference.

- Response letter from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing regarding the "Back to Basics" consultation paper on the Ontario Building Code. [see attached]

Superintendent of Program

**Funding for the Day School Program for Over 21-Year Old Students**

Miss Bond advised of proposed funding changes to this program, noting its implication to a significant number of students in the system. She emphasized that focus should be on working closely with other community groups/agencies in exploring alternative ways of delivering the program, particularly in the area of staffing. Miss Bond will bring further updates on this issue.

The members agreed that SEAC should express to the Ministry of Education and Training its deep concern, outlining clearly the needs of the affected students.

Moved by Mr. Shields:

That the Chairman of the Special Education Advisory Committee write a letter to the Minister of Education and Training expressing SEAC's opposition to the reduction in funding for the Day School Program for over 21-year old students, outlining the serious implications for these students. **CARRIED**

The members agreed further to send a copy of the letter to the Members of Provincial Parliament.

## GENERAL

**Presentation - Children and Adults with Attention Deficit Disorder - C.H.A.D.D.**
This presentation was postponed to a future meeting as the presenter, Ms. Savelli, was unable to come to the meeting due to illness.

**Organization Updates**
The following updates were provided:

☛ Ms. O'Brien [Hamilton Secondary School Principals' Council] apprised the members on various transition programs in the schools for students entering Grade 9 in September.

☛ Ms. Collins [Hamilton Principals' Association] spoke on the many challenges facing special education programs at the elementary schools.

☛ Ms. Simms-Obidi [Autism Ontario, Hamilton-Wentworth Chapter] advised of the Association's forthcoming workshops for teachers, educational assistants and volunteers in August and September. She would provide the details as soon as available.

☛ Mr. Shields [Hamilton Association for Community Living] reported the following:

> The Association's Annual General Meeting on 1996 06 16; the main speaker's theme will be on Education Funding.
> The Ontario Association for Independent Community Living's General Meeting on 1996 05 18.
> The collaborative project on "Building Inclusive Schools" between the Ontario Association for Independent Community Living and Down Syndrome Association.

☛ Mrs. Oommen [Down Syndrome Association] apprised the members on a recent meeting in Waterloo relative to the "Building Inclusive Schools" project.

Referring to meeting practices in other SEAC groups in the province, Mrs. Oommen suggested including a "Pending" section on the SEAC agenda for forthcoming key items; she felt this would avoid "surprises" for the members in addressing important issues.

When members expressed their concerns with the suggestion, Miss Bond said she would endeavour to apprise the members on operational issues as appropriate.

The members called for more open communication between the Board and SEAC, particularly on key educational issues, and a continuing collaborative partnership in meeting the needs of special education students.

☛ Mr. Bucsis [Learning Disabilities Association, Hamilton-Wentworth Chapter] drew the members' attention to the following:

> a brochure on the 1996 Publications from the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada
> the Association's forthcoming Social Skills and Computer Tutoring programs

> at this point, Mr. Bucsis referred to a draft letter from the Ministry of Education and Training regarding "Accountability of School Boards"; he noted two issues of interest: (a) Parents' understanding of their rights and (b) Advocacy in the IPRC process.

The members felt it may be beneficial to invite a representative from the Ministry's regional office to speak on the issue. It was suggested further that this be a collaborative effort among the three area school boards and that parents be invited to participate.

Miss Bond agreed to provide the members with a copy of the draft Ministry letter and timelines (sometime in the Fall) for the proposed event at the next meeting.

**Section 27 Programs [In consideration of the presenter, this agenda item was moved ahead of the second to the last item.]**

Miss Bond gave an overview and then introduced Ms. W. Hutton, Special Education Liaison Consultant (Care, Treatment and Correctional Programs: CTC - Section 27 Programs), who distributed and discussed (using an overhead) the pertinent sections of a brochure on "Educational Programs in the Care, Treatment and Correctional Facilities". [A copy is on file in the Minute Room.]

Noting the forthcoming funding cuts to this program, Ms. Hutton requested SEAC's support in petitioning the Ministry of Education and Training and expressing concerns for the future of this program. To have a better understanding of this program, Ms. Hutton invited the members to visit the CTC facilities.

When made aware that addressing this issue will continue through the Fall, the members requested that more detailed/specific information regarding the circumstances around Section 27 programs be brought back to a future meeting.

It was agreed:

That the presentation regarding Section 27 Programs be received for information.

Moved by Mr. Shields:

That this Committee continue to sit past 21:00 hours. **Carried**

**Update re Special Education Program Delivery**

Using an overhead, Miss Bond briefly apprised the members of the discussion which took place at the recent in-service session with Principals and Special Education representatives. She noted the focus was on the following issues: (a) reduction in the number of special education classes and (b) the Board's special education transportation budget.

During the discussion on the IPRC process, information sheets on (a) "IPRC Process, Criteria for Placement in Special Education Classes" and (b) "IPRC/Annual Review Process and Timelines (May/June, 1996)" were distributed to the members. [A copy is on file in the Minute Room.]

The members provided the following suggestions for further review/consideration:

IPRC

> communication with parents to address the negative perceptions/understanding of the process
> monitoring of/accountability for the process

Transportation - Special Education
> alternative plans

Miss Bond clarified that, within the legislation, the Board is looking into a viable compromise in providing special class placements and transporting exceptional students to schools with special classes.

At this point, Ms. Kappheim reported the following preliminary results from the Transportation Survey - Gifted Program:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total Responses | | 175 |
| Total Possible (New Grade 4/Existing Grades 10-11) | | 200 |
| % Responses (including those choosing regular class) | | 87.5 |
| % Moving to Regular Class | | 0.04 |
| Total Responses | Grade 5 | (42) |
| | Grade 6 | (34) |
| | Grade 7 | (33) |
| | Grade 8 | (29) |
| | Grade 9 | (11) |
| | Grade 10 | ( 6) |
| Total by Category | Junior | 42 |
| | Middle | 98 |
| | Secondary | 27 |
| % by Category (Will walk + Provide own transportation) | Junior | 71.4 |
| | Middle | 94.8 |
| | Secondary | 85.2 |
| Interested in Reduced $ Bus Tickets or Passes | | Almost 50% |

The meeting then adjourned.

Read and confirmed,

_____
Chairman

rt

att.

**Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing**

**Ministère des Affaires municipales et du Logement**

Ontario

**Housing Development & Buildings Branch**
**777 Bay Street, 2nd Floor**
**Toronto, Ontario M5G 2E5**
**(416) 585-6515**
**Fax: (416) 585-7531**

April 4, 1996

Mr. David Bucsis
Chairperson
Special Education Advisory Committee
Board of Education for the
City of Hamilton
P.O. Box 2558
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 3L1

Dear Mr. Bucsis:

Thank you for your letter responding to the Back to Basics consultation paper on the Ontario Building Code.

In your letter you expressed support for maintaining disabled access provisions in the next edition of the Ontario Building Code. You indicated concern that the draft principles in Back to Basics might lead to a reduction in disabled access provisions in the OBC. During the consultation this view was expressed by a significant number of stakeholders.

You will be interested to know, therefore, that our Minister, the Honourable Al Leach, released the attached letter on February 15, 1996 indicating that the Ontario Building Code will continue to address disabled access and, "...we have no plans to reduce the current [disabled access] standards".

Thank you for participating in the consultation process. Your views will be taken into consideration in shaping the 1997 edition of the Ontario Building Code.

Sincerely,

Ann Borooah
Director

Attachment

Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

Office of the Minister

777 Bay Street
Toronto ON M5G 2E5
(416) 585-7000

Ministère des
Affaires municipales
et du Logement

Bureau du ministre

777 rue Bay
Toronto ON M5G 2E5
(416) 585-7000

Ontario

February 15, 1996

Dear Stakeholder:

I understand concerns have been raised that the government intends to reduce or eliminate sections in the Ontario Building Code that ensure access for the disabled. This is not the case.

The government remains committed to an Ontario Building Code that provides for full accessibility and we have no plans to reduce the current standards. However, we do recognize that the Code may not be perfect. That is why we put everything on the table for improvement and issued the consultation paper *Back to Basics*.

Across the government, we are looking at all regulations to see if they actually achieve what they were put in place to do. We plan to keep the regulations that are working, and change or eliminate regulations that do not work.

*Back to Basics* was sent to stakeholders so that they could let us know what they think about the Building Code and whether or not the current provisions need to be changed.

It is clear that initial responses to our consultation paper indicate that there is strong public support for the barrier-free access provisions. Between now and February 29th, however, I continue to invite suggestions for improvements.

*Back to Basics* is the first step in the process of developing the 1997 Building Code. Consultation with all stakeholder groups will be ongoing over the next year and there will be many different opportunities for people to provide input and feedback. We will be looking specifically to hear from people interested in access issues.

Our goal is to put a Building Code in place that meets public goals and consumer needs, minimizes the regulatory burden, and makes wise use of public resources. This cannot happen without active participation from stakeholders.

I hope the public and stakeholders take advantage of the many opportunities for involvement in the Code development process.

Sincerely,

Al Leach
Minister

URBAN\MUNICIPAL
CA4 ON HBL W26
M37
1996

# SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
## 1996 09 18

**Present:** Mr. Bucsis (Chairman), Trustees Bishop and Rogers; Mesdames Bramberger, Burns, Dalziel, Kappheim, Kerr Jaskiewicz, Oommen and Mr. Shields.

**Also Present:** Mesdames E. Collins (Hamilton Principals' Association), P. Hutchinson (Hamilton Teachers' Federation) and S. O'Brien (Hamilton Secondary School Principals' Council).

**Officials Present:** E. Bond (Superintendent of Program), M. Matier (Assistant Superintendent of Schools - Mountain), Dr. J. Tomlinson (Project Team Leader - Special Education) and G. Christmas ((Financial Services Department).

Mr. Bucsis called the meeting to order, noting regrets for not attending were received from Trustees Patenaude and Stewart. He then asked for confirmation of the minutes.

URBAN MUNICIPAL
NOV 19 1996
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Moved by Canon Rogers:

That the minutes of the 1996 05 15 meeting be approved. **CARRIED**

**Remarks**

Project Team Leader - Special Education

Dr. Tomlinson introduced Mr. Lorne Evans, the newly appointed Special Education Consultant with responsibility for Secondary Schools and Gifted Education.

Superintendent of Program

Miss Bond advised that she would be bringing an update on the interim changes relative to secondary school programming as proposed in the Ministry of Education and Training's Secondary School Reform document.

Miss Bond drew the members' attention to the annual banquet [on 1996 10 23 at Michaelangelo's Restaurant] sponsored by the Council for Exceptional Children where special education students from various school boards are given recognition awards.

## GENERAL

**Membership Update**

Resignations

**-Deborah Barr, Hamilton-Wentworth Communication Collective**
**-Dr. H. Van der Spuy, Ontario Psychological Association**

Mr. Bucsis indicated that neither of these Associations has advised of a replacement to date.

Request for membership

**-Ontario Association for Families of Children with Communication Disorders**

Moved by Mrs. Bishop:

That the Special Education Advisory Committee accept the request of the Ontario Association for Families of Children with Communication Disorders to be a Member Association. **CARRIED**

Dr. P. Newberry [Community Resource Person, Chedoke-McMaster Hospitals]
The members questioned why Dr. Newberry's name remains listed on the SEAC Membership directory given her long absence from Committee meetings. Miss Bond agreed to contact Chedoke-McMaster Hospitals to determine any plan for a replacement. She noted, however, that the members should decide on whether a voting member or resource person is appropriate at this time.

At this point, Mr. Shields advised that the Association of Agencies for Treatment and Development (AATD) has expressed strong desire to develop partnerships with the three area boards; he suggested it may be beneficial to invite a representative from this Association to make a presentation to SEAC in the near future. Miss Bond agreed to investigate and bring back feedback to the members.

**Presentation - Easter Seals Parent Delegate Group**
In her presentation, Ms. Kerr Jaskiewicz provided detailed information about the background and specific services provided by the Association. She also distributed brochures outlining these services [a copy of the information package is on file in the Minute Room].

**Verbal Update on Transportation of Exceptional Students**
Ms. Christmas (Financial Services Department) distributed and reviewed an information sheet on "Comparison of Students Transported on Taxis/Vans - 1996 09 17" [a copy on file in the Minute Room].

In responding to the members' questions, Ms. Christmas indicated that a further update, particularly the dollar figures, will be incorporated in the annual Transportation Report to be presented in November.

It was agreed:

That the verbal Update on Transportation of Exceptional Students be received for information.

**Organization Updates**
⇨Ms. Bramberger [Hamilton-Wentworth Home Care Program] advised of key changes for the Association as a result of reforms in the Volunteer program. She would speak on this during her presentation at the next meeting.

⇨Ms. Kappheim [Association for Bright Children] announced her recent appointment as Secretary for the Association's provincial chapter.

⇨Mr. Shields [Hamilton Association for Community Living] spoke on the following:

➦the Association's strategies in assisting and accommodating high school graduate students into the work world. He felt more initiatives should be done in terms of lobbying for government support and advocacy in this area.
➦"Schools Are For Everyone", the Association's presentation paper to the Minister of Education and Training, 1996 05 27 [a copy on file in the Minute Room].

⇨Ms. Dalziel [Hamilton and District Society for Disabled Children] reported on the Association's initiatives in addressing the impact of funding cuts to its various programs/services.

⇨Mr. Bucsis [Learning Disabilities Association, Hamilton-Wentworth Chapter] advised that the Association is continuing with its Social and Computer Skills courses.

⇨Ms. O'Brien [Hamilton Secondary School Principals' Council] reported the following:

➦Hamilton schools initiated an "early contact" with parents to facilitate their children's entry for the September school opening.

➦"Alternatives for You", a community resource which used to be at James Street is now operating at three public schools [Churchill, Westdale and Barton Secondary Schools].

⇨Mrs. Bishop drew the members' attention to the following:

➦information sheet from the Ontario Public School Board's Association re "Special Education: Funding High Cost Needs".

➦consultation with the Ministry of Health regarding pre-school speech and language program to be developed in this community. The plan is anticipated to be in place by December and the District Health Council is overseeing the project with involvement from the community, business organizations, school boards and parents.

**Update re Educational Assistant Allocation**

Mr. Matier distributed/reviewed an information sheet regarding "Educational Assistant Allocation Process" [a copy on file in the Minute Room] and then responded to the members' questions.

Miss Bond affirmed that flexibility permeates the process of addressing specific needs (for Educational Assistant) in the schools.

It was agreed:

That the update re Educational Assistant Allocation be received for information.

**Update re May/June I.P.R.C. Process [carried over from the June 1996 Agenda]**

Dr. Tomlinson distributed a revised Appendix 4 of the Report. The members agreed to further review this Report and then raise their questions/concerns at the next meeting.

**Agenda Planning**

Mr. Bucsis encouraged the members to submit key issues they may wish to include on future Agendas of this Committee.

The meeting then adjourned.

Read and confirmed,

_____

CHAIRMAN

rt

URBAN/MUNICIPAL
CA4 ON HBL W26
M37
1996

# MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
## 1996 11 20

Present: Mr. D. Bucsis (Chairman), Trustee Bishop, Mesdames Bramberger, Dalziel, Kappheim, Oommen and Savelli, Mr. Shields.

Not Present: Trustees Patenaude, Rogers and Stewart, Mesdames Batey, Burns, Kerr-Jaskiewicz and Simms-Obidi, Messrs. Must and Verticchio.

URBAN MUNICIPAL

Also Present: R. Mulholland, Trustee
Pat Hutchinson, Hamilton Teachers' Federation
Eileen Collins, Hamilton Principals Association
Susan O'Brien, Hamilton Secondary School Principals' Council

SEP 12 1997

Officials Present: E. Bond, Superintendent of Program
J. Tomlinson, Project Team Leader - Special Education

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Mr. Bucsis called the meeting to order without a quorum being received, noting regrets for not being able to attend were received from Trustees Patenaude and Stewart, Mesdames Batey, Burns and Kerr-Jaskiewicz.

**Remarks**

Chairman: Mr. Bucsis observed that an election for Committee Chairman would be held at the December meeting. He displayed a sign from the Wentworth County SEAC, two of which were placed in each school. Noting the signs were paid for from their SEAC budget, he added the Wentworth Board is also in the process of preparing a video on the IPRC process.

The issue of the posters for our Board and the updating of the SEAC brochure will be considered at a future meeting.

Project Team Leader - Special Education

Dr. Tomlinson thanked Mr. Bucsis for his leadership as Chair of SEAC over the past two years.

Superintendent of Program

Miss Bond reserved comments, noting the bulk of the committee's time this evening would be spent discussing secondary school reform.

## GENERAL

Membership Update: Mr. Bucsis commented on membership as follows:

- The Canadian National Institute for the Blind has not yet found a replacement;
- The Hamilton-Wentworth Communication Collective appointed a new representative, Sandy Batey;
- The Ontario Psychological Association continues to seek a replacement. Their initial recommendation of Dr. Larry Tuft (Child & Family Centre at Chedoke/McMaster Hospitals) proved to be ineligible as Dr. Tuft does not live in Hamilton. Miss Bond will approach Dr. Tuft offering him the opportunity to sit as a non-voting Resource Member on the committee, replacing the vacancy left by Dr. Newberry.
- The Ontario Association for Families of Children with Communication Disorders has appointed a new representative, Thomas Must.

Correspondence from the Sudbury Board of Education re Cuts to Education at the Provincial Level affecting Special Education at the Classroom Level
Item to be placed on the next agenda for consideration.

**Organizational Updates**
Committee members offered the following updates:
Trustee Bishop a) advised that the District Health Council has received $5 million to implement guidelines for a pre-school Speech Pathologist consultation process, b) requested that Agenda Planning for the upcoming year be placed on the December Agenda and c) provided information to Dr. Tomlinson relative to Building Inclusive Schools - a project funded by the Ministry of Education & Training and the Canadian Association of Community Living. Miss Bond will contact the Ministry for further details.
Down Syndrome Association Mrs. Oommen noted the Annual General Meeting will be held at the end of this month and that a Christmas party is planned.
Learning Disabilities Association Mr. Bucsis advised the L.D.A. held its annual general meeting. Spots are still available for the Association's social and computer skills programs.
Hamilton-Wentworth Home Care Program Ms. Bramberger recalled a news item on the Emily Eaton case regarding the costs of integration which featured research conducted by Dr. Bountrogianni. Miss Bond noted that Dr. Bountrogianni will be presenting another report on her on-going research to the committee early next year.

**Secondary School Reform: Proposed Changes**
Despite the lack of quorum, members proceeded with this workshop to ensure observations from SEAC could be incorporated into the Board's response.

Miss Bond noted that Secondary School Reform changes were initiated by concerns that secondary education is not preparing students for participation in the global economy. She advised the following documents have been provided by the Ministry relative to Secondary School Reform: *Ontario Secondary Schools (1998) Detailed Discussion Document - Curriculum for Ontario Secondary Schools -- Choices Into Action: Guidance and Career Education Policy Grades 1 to 12 (1998) Detailed Discussion Document.*

Prior to commencing the workshop, she asked members to consider the implications of this Reform document for youngsters with special needs. The workshop focused on the shortened version of the Reform document entitled *Excellence in Education: High School Reform A discussion paper.* Using overheads, Miss Bond provided an overview of anticipated changes resulting in a four-year secondary program effective September, 1998.

The following comments were put forth by members during the workshop discussion:

**Concerns:**
- that a combination of Options 1 and 2 be considered rather than students being required to choose Option 1 **or** 2
- the requirement for destination selection in Grade 8 will produce unnecessary anxiety; students are too immature
- implementation process for Grade 7 students - what preparations are being undertaken to bring these children "up to speed"?
- research base that suggests these reform initiatives will be effective?
- results of pilots and research done on destreaming?
- recording on student transcripts of subject "repeats" and each mark obtained:
    - will this lead to costs after the first attempt?
    - opportunity to repeat has to be accessible

- such tracking would impact negatively for special education students which emphasizes the need for resources for special education students
- many special education students have little or no idea about their future or have limited options - sets up unrealistic expectations as they may end up being the responsibility of their parents as there is no programming for them beyond secondary school
- four-year program - appears to be inflexible re time - will students be penalized for taking longer than four years?
- nothing within document refers to IPP modification to courses or credits (although it was noted there is more detail in full outline)
- rationalization of an outcomes-based program with a 90-hour limit to achieve credit - some students will take longer than others to achieve the same outcomes
- clarification about the transcript and flexibility
- Reform document is full of platitudes, cannot make decisions based on its content
- work experience
    - think the number of placements would be unattainable
    - any negotiation with business and industry regarding their ability to support these numbers of placements?
    - the definition of "work experience"
    - quality of the work experience, i.e., must be of value, not just token
    - tax right-off for businesses?
    - more flexibility of choice in work experience but not compulsory
    - difficulty from the business perspective of handling an expansion of work experience placements - impossible
    - work placement situations involves a lot of staff time, especially with special education students
    - business is not creating new job opportunities for full-time workers, i.e., downsizing, how support work placements?
    - need business community to challenge Ministry's assumptions relative to work experience
    - many placements not open to students because of risk, insurance, liabilities involved
    - co-op experience: experience limited to their own community and not necessarily reflective of students' interest or talents - inflexible
    - emphasis on the value of work experience, consider the "European experience" wherein companies have to pay for the right **not** to be involved in work placements
    - opportunity to provide more work experience for specialized students would be of benefit

- increasing number of students who will be marginalized as a result of jobless recovery, i.e. technology and downsizing - psychological impact, loss of self-esteem and hope
- support balanced approach to education that includes being an educated member of society and contributing member of society as well as earning a living to make a life, not just a living
- original assumptions upon which Reform is based are flawed
- how basic level students "pan out" in Series courses, don't have same needs as general level students - reform of secondary education provides very little opportunity for basic level students
- opposed to the idea of "centralized" curriculum, prefer business community/local curriculum developers to be involved in curriculum development to reflect local economy
- Ministry appears to be developing a Grade 7-OAC and a Grade 1-6 concept - but if that's the purpose, it needs to be properly planned, structured throughout
- 1998 implementation - start with only Grade 7 students in 1998?
- Transcripts - review with regard to standards set by colleges and universities, need to be addressed in the context of Reform so students know what is expected of them
- concerns about Grade 11 literacy testing - how done (cost?), purpose, does this need to be done earlier than Grade 11?
- cannot mandate business community involvement

- concern re Series 1 - range of abilities within those courses as all students take them, and concern about assumptions of courses to be included in Series 1
- "enrichment" not in the document
- provincial testing to identify best practices - challenge merits of provincial testing and what is the real purpose. Need provincial test that gives them the data for trends as well as providing teachers with the ability to improve students' outcomes
- had a good experience with inclusive schools, benefit at looking at that experience, i.e. best practices for meeting learning outcomes, supporting best practices
- no reference to SEAC - where does it fit into the context of this policy?

**Comments**
- Extracts - while supportive of the intent and initial statements, no actual reference to special education and special education students
- teacher-advisor system - already informally in place, supportive of concept
- support Certificate of Achievement to recognize accomplishments of those students unable to attain standards for credits
- prior learning assessment very positive; however, it is important that actual assessment is valid to ensure students know the basics, i.e. meet learning outcomes versus "knowing basics". Imperative that it not be perceived as an alternative for gifted students

Lorne Evans, Gifted Special Education Consultant, summarized the observation of special educators relative to the *Ontario Secondary Schools (1998) Detailed Discussion Document*, raising the following concerns:
- lack of reference to trained Special Education teachers, IPRCs, DARTs, IPPs, integration of IPP in reform changes
- where does Bill 82 fit into the context of the Policy Reform document?
- Extract re Special Education actually does not reference special education or special education students

Miss Bond concluded the discussion stating all responses will be analyzed and incorporated into the Board's response; copy to be provided to SEAC members.

Members will be contacted to establish a quorum for the December 18 meeting as it will include a presentation by Gifted students. Ms. Dalziel offered her regrets for that date.

The meeting then adjourned.

Read and confirmed,

.....
Chairman

cv

ACCO USA
WHEELING, ILLINOIS 60090
# 25971
MADE IN USA
0 50505 25971 7
BLACK/NOIR/NEGRO

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 2022 21336042 9